



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/249,229	02/11/1999	GREGORY L. SLAUGHTER	SUN1P209/P36	9705
22434	7590	10/22/2003	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			HOANG, PHUONG N	
P.O. BOX 778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			2126	13
DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/249,229	SLAUGHTER ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuong N. Hoang	Art Unit 2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Douglas Kramer “The Java Platform A White Paper” page 16 - 17.

As to claim 1, Kramer teaches a software object (Fig. 2, page 17, the platform dependent part) comprising a platform dependent method (Fig. 2, page 17, platform-dependent part), a platform independent wrapper (the combination of adapter with porting interface, fig. 2 page 17) arranged to call the platform dependent method, wherein a platform independent object (Java base platform independent) accesses the platform dependent method by calling the wrapper. Kramer's wrapper is independent because it has independent interface.

As to claim 2, Kramer teaches the only operation performed by the wrapper is to act as an intermediary between the platform independent object and the native method (platform dependent) to facilitate calling the platform dependent native method from the platform independent object.

As to claim 3, Kramer teaches the software object is one of a plurality of software objects included in the computer system (there are many adapters associated platform dependent).

As to claim 4, Kramer teaches the platform dependent method is one of a plurality of platform dependent methods (there are many platform dependent part).

As to claim 5, Kramer teaches the wrapper is one of a plurality of wrappers (adapters) each being arranged to call an associated one of the plurality of platform dependent methods.

As to claim 6, Kramer teaches the first software object includes a first wrapper (adapter) and an associated first method designed to run on a first platform (O.S. and Java on a browser).

As to claim 7, Kramer teaches a second software object includes a second wrapper (adapter) and an associated second method designed to run on a second platform (O.S. and Java on desktop) that is different than the first platform.

As to claim 8, Kramer teaches the wrapper is a Java wrapper (Fig. 2, they are Java adapter).

As to claim 9, Kramer teaches the platform independent object is a Java device driver (it is Java platform independent object which has to device driver to communicate with the adapter).

As to claim 10, this is the method claim of claim 1. Refer to claim 1 for rejection. Further, Kramer teaches wrapper associated with the method.

It would have been obvious that Kramer teaches encapsulation object which includes wrapper associated with the method.

As to claim 11, see claim 2 above.

As to claim 12, see claim 4 and 5 above.

It would have been obvious that Kramer teaches encapsulation object is one of the encapsulation object which each includes a wrapper associated with a method.

As to claim 13, Kramer teaches first wrapper (fig. 2), and an associated first method (fig. 2) wherein the first method is designed to run on a first platform (Fig. 2, O.S. of Java on a browser).

It would have been obvious that Kramer teaches first encapsulation object containing first wrapper associated with first method.

As to claim 14, Kramer teaches second wrapper (fig. 2), and an associated second method (fig. 2) wherein the second method is designed to run on a second platform (O.S. of the Java on desktop) that is different than the first platform.

It would have been obvious that Kramer teaches second encapsulation object containing second wrapper associated with second method.

As to claim 15, (see fig. 1 above). Further, Kramer teaches the platform independent object accesses the first method by calling the first wrapper that, in

turn, calls the first method (all the platform independent object can access the method through the wrapper).

As to claim 16, (see fig. 1 above). Further, Kramer teaches the platform independent object accesses the second method by calling the second wrapper that, in turn, calls the second method (all the platform independent object can access the method through the wrapper).

Claims 17 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas Kramer “The Java Platform A White Paper” page 16 - 17, and in view of Dana Lynn Beatty, U.S. patent no. 6,134,616.

As to claim 17, this is the method claim of claim 1 above. See claim 1 for rejection.

Kramer does not teach the business card associated with the platform independent object, configuration data, encapsulation object pointer, system manager.

Beatty teaches a business card (HNS entry, col. 5, lines 35 - 60) associated with the platform independent object, the business card containing configuration data (col. 4, lines 44 – 67 to col. 5, lines 1 – 67) that includes an encapsulation object pointer that is used to identify the encapsulation object, retrieving the business card corresponding to the requesting object (col. 4, lines 44 – 67 to col. 5, lines 1 – 67) by the system manager (bus manager),

instantiating the encapsulation object identified by the encapsulation object pointer (col. 4, lines 44 – 67 to col. 5, lines 1 – 67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Beatty to the Kramer's system because it provides a mechanism to manipulate all devices, retrieve the configuration data based on the business card to know the resource connection between the platform independent object and encapsulation object.

As to claim 18, Beatty teaches the business card is instantiated by a system administrator at system start up (one skilled in the art will understand that the system administration would configure at the system initiation).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Beatty to the Kramer's system because it provides a mechanism to control all devices.

As to claim 19, Kramer teaches the platform independent object is a device driver (an object has a device driver to communicate), wherein the device driver is used to manage a device couple to the computer system (this is the functionality of device driver).

As to claim 20, Beatty teaches the system manager is a bus manager (col. 4, lines 44 – 67 to col. 5, lines 1 – 67) used to manage a bus couple to the device.

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Beatty to the Kramer's system because it provides a mechanism to control all devices and carry a request from the device driver to the specific wrapper.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 4/17/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After carefully reviewing the reference, the examiner sees that the reference still anticipates the claims.

The 112 first paragraph has been dropped based on the specification (page 5 line 19 – page 6 line 6). Applicant's disclosed wrapper interface is the same for every platform, but the wrapper implementation is dependent to the specific platform (see page 5, lines 20 – 25). This is the same as the prior art.

Applicant argued that the office action stated the "adapter" of Smith is "equivalent" to applicant's wrapper. The adapter of Smith is not equivalent. It anticipates the recited wrapper. It is the same thing.

Applicant argued that Java base platform of prior art is platform independent (page 9 lines 9 – 11). Java base platform of prior art is the same as object 106a of applicant that is used to call wrapper (page 5 lines 22 – 24).

Applicant argued that the porting interface has a platform independent part. Adapter of the prior art is the same as the wrapper 102a that is associated with a platform dependent 104a and calls the platform native/dependent method 104a (page 5 lines 20 – 25).

Applicant argued that the adapters are in a platform-dependent part. The interface of both the adapter and wrapper are ported. The interface of both are called by platform independent objects (106a and Java base platform) and the interface is

platform independent. Both the adapter and wrapper implementation are platform dependent.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2126

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

Ph

October 15, 2003



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100